

B. What Issues is EPA Requesting Public Comment On?

The Agency welcomes public comment on any aspect of the methodology used to develop the draft RCRA PBT List, including the data sources, ranking criteria and scoring schemes, the cutoff criteria, and the final adjustments to the List. The Agency also requests comment on the specific issues listed below. The Agency is not requesting comment on the data or methodology used to develop the WMPT, or the scoring results of the WMPT. The WMPT went through a thorough, comprehensive and constructive public review and comment process. EPA has incorporated its response to those comments in the underpinnings of today's notice and therefore does not believe comments regarding the WMPT are generally pertinent to this effort.

Specific issues for comment include:

1. Banned Chemicals

Is it appropriate to eliminate chemicals from consideration for the draft RCRA PBT List because they are no longer used in production or generated in hazardous waste, or are generated in very limited quantities from very few production processes, and therefore are not good candidates for future reductions through waste minimization? Is it appropriate to eliminate banned pesticides, PCBs, and alkyl lead for this reason, as the Agency has done in developing the List?

2. Waste Minimization Feasibility

Should the agency eliminate from consideration PBT chemicals contained in hazardous waste for which there are few feasible waste minimization options available, or should the agency consider these as an incentive to encourage research and development of waste minimization methods for these chemicals?

3. "Non-measurable" Chemicals

The draft RCRA PBT List includes 16 chemicals that were reported in the National Hazardous Waste Constituent Survey but are not reported in the Toxics Release Inventory, and therefore, cannot be easily tracked over time. Is it appropriate to include on the List chemicals for that TRI data, or other annual chemical-specific data, are not readily available for tracking national chemical reduction progress? Are there other reliable national sources of chemical reporting data that could be used to track generation and reductions of these chemicals?

4. Chemicals With Very High P, B, and/or T Values

Should chemicals with very high data values for persistence, bioaccumulation potential, human toxicity, and/or ecological toxicity (e.g., with values at the top end of the data distributions) be considered for addition to the RCRA PBT List, even though TRI data are not available for tracking progress? How would progress be measured for these chemicals?

5. Chemicals With Low Reported Quantities

Several chemicals on the RCRA PBT List are estimated in the National Hazardous Waste Constituent Survey to be generated in quantities of less than 100 pounds per year. The Agency did not use a specific quantity cutoff in developing the RCRA PBT List. Should a quantity cutoff be used? If so, what is the appropriate value for the cutoff? Should different cutoffs be used for chemicals which are the most toxic compared to others which are less toxic? If so, what should those cutoffs be?

6. Priorities Identified by Other Organizations.

Should EPA add to the RCRA PBT List State or other organization's priority chemicals which do not already appear on the List? Among these chemicals, should those with low or no PBT scores (e.g., waste solvents), or those with low or no chemical quantities (e.g., some Level 1 U.S./Canada Binational Agreement chemicals) be included? A list of chemical priorities identified by several States is located in RCRA docket number F-98-MMLP-FFFFF.

7. Including Recycled Wastes in Determining Quantities of RCRA-Relevant Waste Associated with Chemicals

In considering the quantity and prevalence of candidates for the RCRA PBT List (step C.4 above), the Agency included quantities that were recycled in its scoring procedure. Should recycled quantities be included when determining the quantities of chemicals associated with hazardous wastes in developing the RCRA PBT List, or should EPA measure chemicals only at the point of generation?

Dated: October 30, 1998.

Elizabeth A. Cotsworth,

Acting Director, Office of Solid Waste.

[FR Doc. 98-29952 Filed 11-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION**Farm Credit Administration Board****Sunshine Act Meeting**

AGENCY: Farm Credit Administration.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)), of the forthcoming regular meeting of the Farm Credit Administration Board (Board).

DATE AND TIME: The regular meeting of the Board will be held at the offices of the Farm Credit Administration in McLean, Virginia, on November 12, 1998, from 9:00 a.m. until such time as the Board concludes its business.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Floyd Fithian, Secretary to the Farm Credit Administration Board, (703) 883-4025, TDD (703) 883-4444.

ADDRESS: Farm Credit Administration, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102-5090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Parts of this meeting of the Board will be open to the public (limited space available), and parts of this meeting will be closed to the public. In order to increase the accessibility to Board meetings, persons requiring assistance should make arrangements in advance. The matters to be considered at the meeting are:

Open Session**A. Approval of Minutes**

—October 8, 1998 (Open and Closed)

B. New Business**1. Regulation**

—Balloting and Stockholder Reconsideration Issues (Final) [12 CFR Part 611]

2. Other

—Statement on Regulatory Burden (Notice of Intent; Comment Period Extension)

Closed Session***C. Report**

—OSMO Report

* Session Closed—Exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(8) and (9).

Date: November 5, 1998.

Floyd Fithian,

Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.

[FR Doc. 98-30102 Filed 11-5-98; 1:18 pm]

BILLING CODE 6705-01-P